

REMARKS

In light of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 22-33, 52-55 and 57-60 are presented herein.

The Examiner stated that claims 22-33 are allowed. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of the allowance of claims 22-33.

The Examiner rejected claims 52, 55, 57 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a Japanese Patent Application by NEC (JPO 09233093A, hereinafter "NEC").

Independent claim 52, recites in part as follows:

"Wireless transmission system comprising...
a plurality of fixed hubs...wherein...
there is no handover between said fixed hubs." (Underlining and Bold added for emphasis.)

It is respectfully submitted that NEC fails to teach the above-recited feature of independent claim 52.

At page 3, line 10 of the present Final Office Action, regarding claim 52, the Examiner stated that "the NEC document **does not** disclose any hand-over between fixed hubs." (Emphasis ours) At page 3, lines 11-16 of the present Final Office Action the Examiner appears to address this deficiency of NEC. However, it is respectfully submitted that such portion of the Final Office Action does not appear to address the feature of **no hand-over between fixed hubs.** Instead, in this portion of the Final Office Action, the Examiner indicated that "LANs have been known to provide wireless connection to mobile hand held devices" and that "it would have been

obvious...to expand the capabilities of the WLAN to communicate with mobile station as well.” However, these statements relate to a communication between a mobile station (user terminal) and a network, and it does not appear to address the issue of “no handover between said fixed hubs,” as instantly claimed. Therefore, amended independent claim 52 is believed to be distinguishable over NEC.

Furthermore, applicants submit that claims 55, 57 and 58 depend from independent claim 52, and are therefore distinguishable for at least the reason described above with regard to claim 52.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the rejection of claims 52, 55, 57 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 53 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over NEC in view of Fischer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,075).

Claims 53 and 54 depend from independent claim 52, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from NEC for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Fischer to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of NEC. Therefore, claims 53 and 54 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of NEC and Fischer.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the rejection of claims 53 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 59 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over NEC in view of Kawamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,133).

Claims 59 and 60 depend from independent claim 52, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from NEC for at least the reasons previously

described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Kawamoto to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of NEC. Therefore, claims 59 and 60 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of NEC and Kawamoto.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the rejection of claims 59 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By:



Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800